

Date: Wed, 19 May 93 02:36:27 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #153  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Wed, 19 May 93                      Volume 93 : Issue    153

Today's Topics:

- 11m vs Hams (was No-Code Stupidity) (3 msgs)
  - ARRL internet address??? [answer]
  - High speed Morse code requirement
    - Morse et cetera...
    - no-code defense
  - No-Code Stupidity
    - No Code Debate
- Summary of No-code vs Code arguments

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----  
Date: Wed, 19 May 1993 00:09:13 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!  
ez006683@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: 11m vs Hams (was No-Code Stupidity)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

r\_fussel@oz.plymouth.edu (Ronald D. Fussell) writes:  
: In article <C78u5o.99r@ucdavis.edu> ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D.  
Todd) writes:  
: >  
: > Well, I'm sure you're a seasoned pro at this, and you've "seen it  
: >all", but if you are trying to tell me that the INTENTIONAL name  
: >calling, overpowering, and overall rudeness on the HF bands are equal  
: >to 11 meters, you've got to be kidding me. I was a CBer for a while  
: >before I got my ticket, so I can say that I've seen both ends of the



Yes flame is an inappropriate word. It usually means a personal attack. Ah! a lame argument, now that is a much clearer assertion to be sure. I obviously didn't feel it was such a lame argument. I was not intending to pick apart your words. I was merely responding to your post based upon the words you chose. When you use a language to build an argument the language you use does reflect the argument. The same holds true for the use of profanity in an argument, it does reflect upon the meaning of the argument. If you misuse the words how am I to know that you meant something different? eg. after listing four or five offensive behaviours you then say you have never seen such activities on HF How am I to know that you only meant to say you have never seen any instances of one of the activities. Picking apart your words would have been attempts to pick at your grammar and spelling. Something I'll refrain from as I am certainly guilty of the same or similar infractions of.

That's a silly assertion. ofcourse my arguments are based on MY feelings and yours are based on your own feelings. Or are you suggesting that your feelings about the ARRL are strictly factual and have nothing to do with your feelings? If you would like a deeper understanding of theory ladenness in argument and science read Kuhn's book \*The Structure of Scientific Revolutions\* There are whole classes and even degrees that deal with the theory ladenness of science. I think that to require complete objectivity in this forum is silly.

: This thread has taken a turn so I will resstate my original  
: argument. 11 meters is less mature, ruder, and overall less  
: professional than the rest of HF. If anyone would like to continue  
: thread on that subject, that is fine. As for us, Dan, our little  
: argument holds no ground here in this group, and I suggest we move it  
: to e-mail in order to conserve the bandwidth.

Geeze is that all you were saying? I thought you were trying to say that there was some correlation between the mess on 11 and no-code licensing. I have no idea about the relative amount of rudeness etc. between CB and Ham bands.

I'll butt out.

Dan

```
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                    Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu              *
*                    Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102              *
*                    Davis CA 95616                            *
*-----*
*      I do not speak for the University of California....    *
*      and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!            *
*-----*
```

-----  
Date: Wed, 19 May 93 03:29:36 GMT  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!oz.plymouth.edu!  
r\_fussel@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: 11m vs Hams (was No-Code Stupidity)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>Geeze is that all you were saying? I thought you were trying to say that  
>there was some correlation between the mess on 11 and no-code licensing.  
>I have no idea about the relative amount of rudeness etc. between CB and  
>Ham bands.

Well Dan, I'm glad you read my other posts, and read the subject  
header, 11m vs Hams. You probably wouldn't have gotten into any  
trouble if you remembered the basics, to be exact, reading the subject  
header and my previous posts before contributing pointless arguments.

>I'll butt out.

Thank you

Ron N1HIB

-----  
Date: Tue, 18 May 93 20:53:12 CDT  
From: sdd.hp.com!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!  
robert@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: 11m vs Hams (was No-Code Stupidity)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

> >obnoxious behaviors that certain Morsely impaired individuals in the

Morsely impaired individuals? That's a new one on me. Hey Todd, perhaps  
you can use that as a disability, and request a handicap waiver from the  
code elements. Just think...you could sail all the way to Extra, with  
hardly any effort on your part at all!

--Robert

-----  
Date: 19 May 93 09:02:31 GMT  
From: amdahl!amdahl!ikluft@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: ARRL internet address??? [answer]

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

murphyed1@woods.ulowell.edu writes:

>Does the ARRL have an internet address??? Is it FTP able?>???

Yes they are on the Internet. The domain is arrl.org. No, you can't directly connect to it because their network provider dynamically assigns addresses from a pool when they connect. (I assume it's a SLIP or PPP phone line from the description they gave me.)

They can do e-mail. They also have a large e-mail information server (info@arrl.org) which can send you all kinds of useful information.

This is all described in the Frequently-Asked Questions (FAQ) articles. The relevant parts are shown below.

--excerpt from Ham Radio FAQ-----  
Rec.radio.amateur.misc Frequently Asked Questions  
Part 2 - Amateur Radio Organizations, Services, and Information Sources  
-----

[...]

\*\* Where can I find Ham Radio information with a computer?

[...]

\* The ARRL e-mail server

ARRL is the American Radio Relay League, representing and promoting Amateur Radio in the USA. They have established an automated file server which responds to information requests via electronic mail. To use the server, send mail to info@arrl.org with any number of one-line commands in your message. Valid commands are as follows:

help	sends more detailed instructions about the e-mail server
index	sends a list of the files currently available
send file	sends a file (replace "file" with the file's name) several files are referenced by name in parts of this FAQ
quit	ends command processing - use it if a signature will be appended to your message

The server program will respond to the commands, each in a separate message. Among many other informative files, a current copy of the FAQ (updated monthly) can be obtained from the ARRL e-mail server.

[...]

\*\* Can I send ARRL or W5YI electronic mail?

Several ARRL HQ staffers can be contacted via the net. Their e-mail addresses are available from the ARRL e-mail file server in the file called "email". See above for more information on the ARRL e-mail server.

ARRL requests that you include your postal address (the slow kind) in case they need to send you nonelectronic material in answer to your request.

W5YI, a large VEC, can be reached at the following address:  
Fred Maia, W5YI 3511297@mcimail.com

--end of excerpt-----  
--

Ian Klufft KD6EUI PP-ASEL Amdahl Corporation, Open Systems Development  
iklufft@uts.amdahl.com Santa Clara, CA  
[disclaimer: any opinions expressed are mine only... not those of my employer]

-----  
Date: Wed, 19 May 1993 07:22:29 GMT  
From: swrinde!gatech!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: High speed Morse code requirement  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <VBREAUULT.93May18175328@rinhp750.gmr.com> vbreault@rinhp750.gmr.com  
(Val Breault) writes:  
[Val's post is both intelligent and lucid, read it. I'm only addressing  
one point here.]

>There is an international agreement that requires knowledge of Morse  
>code to operate below 50 MHz and the U.S. licensing structure is not

^^-- 30 MHz, changed at the last competent WARC  
over US objections.

>likely to change in the next couple of years.

>

>I therefore suggest that folks accept the way things are but continue  
>to work Through the system to affect a change.

This is true. We need to do the grassroots political groundwork to get the idea of relevance into people's consciousness before there will be effective pressure for the US, and other, governments to come to a competent WARC and change the international treaty requirements. That's the main reason I'm here in this debate. The nations have decided that manual Morse is no longer necessary for other services (see relevant Coast Guard posting), but pressure from already licensed amateurs, mostly in the US, has kept the manual Morse testing requirement in the amateur service regulations. At the last competent WARC, it was the US almost singlehandedly that kept the Morse requirement from being completely dropped. This Morse Preservation Society attitude is likely to push the amateur service further into the backwaters of communications relevance as time goes on.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

-----

Date: Wed, 19 May 93 06:05:10 GMT

From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!wupost!

csus.edu!netcom.com!netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!

spica.la.locus.com!dana@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: Morse et cetera...

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <4RLP4B1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com> robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

>

>Your license class makes a big difference, Dan. If you are an Extra, then  
>your argument has credibility. If you are a Technician, then in the eyes  
>of the group you are whining. I'm sorry, Dan, but I just don't buy it.  
>I'll make a wager with you. Upgrade through the amateur ranks to Extra.  
>It's not difficult, but be advised that it does take effort. When you  
>have accomplished that, let me know what your opinion on the subject at  
>hand is. I predict either one of two things will occur: you will upgrade,  
>and your opinion will change, or you will never upgrade, and continue  
>to whine.

Please do not presume to speak for me. "In the eyes of the group", indeed!

I do not think Dan was whining. I rather think the rabid "You'll love CW" group has been doing the whining. I have upgraded through the ranks to Extra, and (a) I agree with Dan, and (b) Dan's argument is credible regardless of his license class.

Your sage prediction is quite wrong. I \*am\* an Extra, and I agree with Dan's argument. What makes you think you know everything? Why can't you engage in an intelligent discussion of the relevance of CW to modern amateur licensing without resorting to license class bashing, personal attacks, and plain old sentimental paranoia?

Robert, I challenge you to explain why 13 and 20 WPM CW is relevant to the amateur licensing process today. Please avoid emotional arguments, and simply give me an objective explanation how higher speed CW requirements accomplish the goals outlined in Part 97.1.

--

\* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are \*  
\* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily \*  
\* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer  
\*  
\* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests \*

-----  
Date: Tue, 18 May 1993 19:36:08 EST  
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!news@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: no-code defense  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

> system@mooch.sbs.com (Christopher Ogren) writes:  
>  
>>If that is not the truth...what is? Put an ounce of effort into morse  
>>code and you'd have it licked. But it is easier for you to complain.  
>>Again I realize that some people believe the LCD is what this hobby  
>>needs. What this hobby needs is capable amateurs not people who need an  
>>excuse for why they can't GET something. It's called work people.  
>  
> Naw, if we stooped to the LCD in this hobby, we'd all have to get sbs  
> accounts. I was hoping we could come up with a scheme where we'd limit the  
> extra class licenses to operate only in the extra portions of the bands.  
> That way the majority of hams wouldn't have to put up with their incessant  
> whining about the good old days, CB transplants, their latest bowel  
> movement, and how great incentive licensing is. ;-) You guys are the  
> greatest incentive I can think of to \*not\* upgrade (at least not to extra.)  
>  
> 73,  
> Todd  
> N9MWB

You just don't leave well enough alone Todd, do you?

-----  
Tony Pelliccio kd1nr/ae "Usenet is like a herd of performing elephants  
\*!\*!\*!\*!\*!\*!\*!\*!\*!\* with diarrhea -- massive, difficult to  
system@garlic.sbs.com redirect, awe-inspiring, entertaining, and a  
----- source of mind-boggling amounts of excrement  
when you least expect it." --spaf (1992)

-----  
Date: Wed, 19 May 93 06:10:39 GMT



From: overload.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!wupost!  
csus.edu!netcom.com!netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!  
spica.la.locus.com!dana@@dog.ee.lbl.gov  
Subject: No-Code Stupidity  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993May17.195817.11106@oz.plymouth.edu> r\_fussel@oz.plymouth.edu  
(Ronald D. Fussell) writes:

>  
>Code  
>requirements are great to keep our bands from turning into 11 meters.  
>

Okay, Ron, please explain, objectively, how code requirements are great  
to keep our bands from turning into 11 meters.

By the way, is today really your 19th birthday? Happy Birthday!

--

\* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are \*  
\* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily \*  
\* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer  
\*  
\* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests \*

-----

Date: Wed, 19 May 1993 06:59:57 GMT  
From: swrinde!gatech!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: No Code Debate  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C78nu2.HGv@news.iastate.edu> njohnson@sysad.cnde.iastate.edu (Neil  
Johnson) writes:

>I'm currently a Technician Class operator (a no coder).  
>  
>I plan to learn code (I have most of the alphabet down now)  
>and upgrade to at least General before the year ends.  
>  
>I will personally feel a great sense of accomplishment for achieving  
>something that required effort and self-discipline.  
>  
>It will be a feeling that nobody can take away from me.  
>  
>I had the same feeling when I finished my first computer program.  
>I had the same feeling when I got my B.S. in Computer Engineering.  
>I had the same feeling when I got my yellow, then orange belt in Tae Kwon Do.  
>I had the same feeling when I was recognized for being an outstanding first year

>Jaycee.  
>I had the same feeling when I passed my no-code exam.  
>  
>I believe that's what this debate finally comes down to; Whether or not code is a  
>technical requirement or part of the personal challenge of becoming a HAM.  
>  
>I feel it is a personal challenge.  
>  
>Even if the code-requirement is no-longer required for HF priveleges, I will  
still  
>take pride in having put the effort into learning Morse code.

"Feelings" have no place in government regulations. As you note in your last line, you'll have the same "feeling" whether it's a Federal requirement or not. Fine. No one is going to tell you not to learn manual Morse encoding any more than someone is going to tell you not to collect antique radios, or learn to speak Greek, or learn to play the guitar. But it has no relevance to operating \*other\* modes on amateur radio. Any regulation that currently says it does is flawed and needs to be changed.

Dube noted in another post that testing of high speed manual Morse encoding ability is required for the Extra CW segments. That's at least relevant, though a bit silly since if you can't do it you can't participate effectively anyway, so the testing is redundant. However, such testing has no relevance for the Extra exclusive \*phone\* segments of the HF bands. That's flawed regulation and needs to be changed.

There are three schools of thought among the proponents of continued irrelevant manual Morse encoding testing. The first is the "I had to do it, therefore so should you" school. This is rite of passage nonsense and deep down these people know it. The second school is the "it keeps the riff-raff out" group. There's ample evidence on 75 and 20 meters today that this argument is null. In fact there's ample evidence right here in this forum that the Morsely-damaged can exhibit poor character. The third, and largest, group of manual Morse encoding testing proponents is the group that deep down fears that if forced code testing is dropped, their favorite mode will disappear from the bands because it can't stand the competition with superior methods. This is a real fear, but I think it's overblown. As long as Morse is legal to use, there will be a few people like you who "feel" the need to learn it. Like the AM and RTTY enthusiasts, they'll keep the elderly mode alive simply from nostalgia. Finally, there are those pragmatists who will keep the mode alive for it's ease of implementation and use. They don't care if it's required or not, it's useful and that's enough.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary

Destructive Testing Systems	we break it.	uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way	Guaranteed!	emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244		

-----  
Date: Tue, 18 May 93 21:41:58 GMT  
From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!torn!nott!uotcsi2!  
revcan!balsam!cowan@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Summary of No-code vs Code arguments  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I have been watching this debate fill up space on my hard disk at an unbelievable rate over the last while, so I thought I'd sumamrise the whole thing for the benefit of those not fortunate enough to have caught the entire exchange:

- 1) There are a bunch of amateurs who think that anyone without a morse code qual isn't a true amateur.
- 2) There are a bunch of amateurs who think that the people referred to in #1 are elitist snobs.
- 3) The law in both Canada and the US says you can be an amateur without code and this is unlikely to change, furthering the opinion of the the people in group #2.
- 4) There are jerks on CB.
  - 4a) Not everyone on CB is a jerk.
- 5) There are jerks on amateur radio.
  - 5a) Not everyone on amateur radio is a jerk.
- 6) Some people have some romantic idea that amateur radio should be or is still composed of introverted people sitting in shacks in the middle of a field with some tubes, wires and a spark gap xmtr like the good (really) old days.
- 7) Other people believe that the purpose of amateur radio is to allow for personal communication and to provide an interesting and educational hobby for many people - in fact, as many as is possible and reasonable.

That's it folks... Despite all the whining, sniping, bitching, arguing, fighting and other really productive intercourse, that is the summary of all that has been determined.

Because of point (#3), the whole argument about "To Morse or not to Morse" is really quite irrelevant. Perhaps we could get off the topic and on to something more directly related to policy - like reciprocal licensing agreements, opening new bands to amateurs or whatever... perhaps a topic on which a conclusion can actually be reached!

-very tired of this crapola  
Darin Cowan

--

Darin Cowan - cowan@balsam.pinetree.org | I just try to make people's  
VE3 OIJ | lives a little more surreal

-----

Date: Tue, 18 May 93 23:28:32 GMT  
From: swrinde!sdd.hp.com!cs.utexas.edu!uwm.edu!wupost!csus.edu!netcom.com!  
netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!lando.la.locus.com!  
dana@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May14.231949.29392@leland.Stanford.EDU>,  
<1993May16.181124.107689@locus.com>, <1993May17.165536.17953@leland.Stanford.EDU>.  
Subject : Re: More on no-code

In article <1993May17.165536.17953@leland.Stanford.EDU> paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu  
(Paul Flaherty) writes:

>In article <1993May16.181124.107689@locus.com> dana@spica.la.locus.com (Dana H.  
Myers) writes:

>>C'mon Paul, the discussion here is with respect to Amateur radio. 47 CFR  
>>part 97, specifically 97.1, explains the basis and purpose of the Amateur  
>>Radio Service. 97.1 makes no reference to minimizing the use of the  
>>spectrum allocated to the Amateur Radi Service.

>

>It also doesn't make reference to enforcement, levying fines, or anything  
>else that's in the Communications Act or its subsequent amendments. That's  
>the way Administrative Law is written; those principles in the Enabling  
>Legislation are not repeated in the CFRs.

True, but I \*thought\* this discussion had to do with licensing  
procedures and the goals of the FCC for the Amateur Radio Service.

--

\* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are \*  
\* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily \*  
\* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer  
\*  
\* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests \*

-----  
Date: Tue, 18 May 1993 19:30:12 EST  
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!news@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <930514.085910.0J5.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com>,  
<9Tmm4B1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com>, <1993May17.051322.112882@locus.com>  
Subject : Re: Morse et cetera...

dana@pleione.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) writes:

> While non-coded Techs may be complaining about the lack of HF privs, I have  
> yet to hear it. I'm not in favor of eliminating the 5 WPM CW test; I'm  
> in favor of eliminating (or providing sensible alternatives to) the  
> 13 and 20 WPM tests, since it appears that the utility of higher speed  
> CW operators is now obsolete.  
>  
> Of course, now we have Tony and Robert crowing about lowered standards  
> and all the other ills in society. Maybe lowered standards are a bad  
> idea; look what happened at SBS....

Dana, first off we're from different sites. I have my feelings about the  
no-code license, and you have yours. Other than that, what problem do  
you have with the standards at SBS? They're quite high.

Tony

-----  
Tony Pelliccio kd1nr/ae      "Usenet is like a herd of performing elephants  
\*!#!\*!#!\*!#!\*!#!\*!      with diarrhea -- massive, difficult to  
system@garlic.sbs.com      redirect, awe-inspiring, entertaining, and a  
-----      source of mind-boggling amounts of excrement  
                                 when you least expect it." --spaf (1992)

-----  
Date: Wed, 19 May 1993 04:22:13 GMT  
From: swrinde!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!moe.ksu.ksu.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!  
newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!vincent1.iastate.edu!  
jeffries@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May17.214208.22929@nnnnpd2.cxo.dec.com>,  
<1993May18.105200.10880@anomaly.sbs.com>,  
<1993May18.131251.13893@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>p  
Subject : Re: No-Code Stupidity

To all on this newsgroup involved in the most recent no-code "debate",

I am truly disgusted with the no-code vs. code flamewar, and won't be reading this newsgroup for a while. I suspect (but suspect only) that many others will be doing the same.

Flames may be e-mailed directly to me at [jeffries@iastate.edu](mailto:jeffries@iastate.edu).

--

Anthony Glen Jeffries  
Journalism and Mass Communication student  
Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #153

\*\*\*\*\*